

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

PRISCELLA SAINTAL-BOWMAN,  
Plaintiff(s),

v.

LV METROPOLITCAL POLICE DEPT., et  
al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01481-ART-NJK

**ORDER**

[Docket Nos. 53, 56, 59]

Pending before the Court are several motions. Defendants filed a motion to extend the deadline for the filing of dispositive motions. Docket No. 53. No response was filed. *See* Docket. Plaintiff filed a motion to extend the discovery deadlines. Docket No. 56. Defendants filed a response to this motion, in which they ask the Court to deny the motion as moot and include an unsigned proposed stipulation to extend the discovery deadlines. *See* Docket No. 58-1 at 4-8. No reply was filed. *See* Docket. Defendants subsequently filed a stipulation to re-open the discovery deadlines. Docket No. 59. These motions are properly resolved without a hearing. Local Rule 78-1. For the reasons discussed below, the parties' proposed stipulation to extend the discovery deadlines is **DENIED** without prejudice and the parties' motions to extend the discovery deadlines are **DENIED** as moot.

The parties' stipulation seeks to reopen expired deadlines. Docket No. 59. The parties, however, make no attempt to establish excusable neglect for the failure to timely request these extensions. *See* Local Rule 26-3. Therefore, the parties' stipulation for extension of the discovery deadlines is **DENIED** for failure to comply with the Local Rules. Docket No. 59. In light of the

1 parties' intention to extend the discovery period, the parties' corresponding motions to extend  
2 discovery deadlines are **DENIED** as moot. Docket Nos. 53, 56. The parties may file a new  
3 stipulation to extend the discovery deadlines that fully complies with all Local Rules.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: September 5, 2023

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
10 United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28